Paper No. _____
Filed: January 20, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

IBG LLC; INTERACTIVE BROKERS LLC; TRADESTATION GROUP, INC.; and TRADESTATION SECURITIES, INC.,

Petitioners,

v.

TRADING TECHNOLOGIES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case CBM2016-0054
U.S. Patent 7,693,768

PATENT OWNER'S RESPONSE

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW OF CLAIMED INVENTION 5

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 10

A. "Single Action" 10

B. "Computer Readable Medium Having Program Code Recorded Thereon" 10

C. "Order Entry Region" 11

D. "Setting a Plurality of Parameters for a Trade Order Relating to the Commodity and Sending the Trade Order to the Electronic Exchange in Response to a Selection of a Particular Location of the Order Entry Region by a Single Action of a User Input Device" 12

E. "Entered Order Indicator in Association with a Price Level Along the Price Axis" 13

F. "Centering Command" 13

III. TSE IS NOT PRIOR ART 14

A. The Evidence Fails to Prove TSE Was Publicly Accessible 15

1. TSE Was Not Distributed to POSAs 16

2. There Is No Evidence TSE Was Available to the POSA Exercising Reasonable Diligence 17

B. Kawashima's Testimony Is Uncorroborated and Biased, and Therefore Legally Insufficient 22

1. Kawashima's Testimony Is Uncorroborated 22

2. Kawashima Is Not a Disinterested Witness 23

IV. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS 24

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

A. TSE and Belden Fail to Render Obvious the Claimed "Order Entry Region" and "Setting a Plurality of Parameters ... By a Single Action . . ." 25

B. TSE and Belden Fail to Render Obvious the Claimed "At Least One First [/ Second] Fixed Location" and "Updating the Display of the First [/ Second] Indicator" 27

C. Petitioners Have Failed to Set Forth A Motivation To Combine TSE and Belden 29

D. Dependent Claim 6 32

E. Dependent Claim 7-9 33

F. Dependent Claim 11 35

V. REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE PROVES THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS NOT OBVIOUS 35

A. The Claimed Invention Went Against Conventional Wisdom 36

B. Overwhelming Secondary Considerations Prove That the Invention Is Not Obvious 43

1. Problems with Conventional GUI Tools Went Unrecognized 46

2. The Invention Provided Unexpected Results 48

3. The Invention Was Received with Initial Skepticism, but Was Ultimately Demanded by Traders 51

4. The Invention Enjoyed Tremendous Commercial Success 56

5. The Invention Was Widely Copied 62

6. The Invention Received Widespread Praise in the Industry 69

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

7. The Invention Also Received Widespread Industry Acquiescence 71

8. Others Failed to Make The Invention 72

9. Other Evidence Proves Non-obviousness....75

C. The Real-World Evidence Establishes That TSE Would Have Been Rejected by a POSA, Which Provides an Additional Basis for Non-Obviousness....76

VI. THE CLAIMS SATISFY SECTION 101 78

A. The Federal Circuit Recently Affirmed The Patentability Of The '768 Parent's Claims....78

B. TT's Claims Are Not Directed To An "Abstract Idea" Under Alice Prong One 79

1. Petitioners Ignore and Overgeneralize the Claim Elements....79

2. TT's Claims Pass Part I of Alice Because They Set Forth a Specific Implementation That Solves a Problem With Computer Technology....81

3. TT's Claims Pass Part I of Alice Because They Are Undoubtedly Not Abstract 83

4. TT's Claims Pass Part I of Alice Because GUIs Are Technology....84

5. TT's Claims Are Not Directed to Fundamental Economic or Longstanding Commercial Practices, or Business Methods 85

C. The Claims Pass Part II of Alice Because They Recite an Inventive Concept....87

D. The Claimed Invention Is Patent-Eligible Under §101 Because the Claims Do Not Cover Signals....89

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

VII. CBM REVIEW 90

A. The ’768 Patent Does Not Claim “Data Processing” or “Other Operation[]” (e.g., a Business Method) 90

B. The ’768 Patent Falls Under the Technological Exception 91

VIII. CONCLUSION 93

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.